arXiv:1009.2136v1 [math.PR] 11 Sep 2010

Stochastic Shear Thickening Fluids: Strong Convergence of the Galerkin Approximation and the Energy Equality[1]

Nobuo Yoshida[2]

Abstract

We consider a SPDE (stochastic partial differential equation) which describes the velocity field of a viscous, incompressible non-Newtonian fluid subject to a random force. Here, the extra stress tensor of the fluid is given by a polynomial of degree $p-1$ of the rate of strain tensor, while the colored noise is considered as a random force. We focus on the shear thickening case, more precisely, on the case: $p \in [1+\frac{d}{2}, \frac{2d}{d-2})$, where d is the dimension of the space. We prove that the Galerkin scheme approximates the the velocity field in a strong sense. As a consequence, we establish the energy equality for the velocity field.

Contents

1 Introduction 2
1.1 Function spaces 3
1.2 The noise 4
1.3 The SPDE 4
1.4 The Galerkin approximation 5

2 The strong convergence of the Galerkin approximation and the energy equality 6
2.1 Strong convergence of the Garelkin approximation 6
2.2 The energy equality 8
2.3 Remarks on the 2D stochastic Navier-Stokes equation 8

3 Proof of Theorem 2.1.1 9
3.1 (3.2) implies (3.3)–(3.4) 9
3.2 The bound by Gronwall's lemma 10
3.3 Proof of (3.2) 13
3.4 Proof of Corollary 2.1.2 18

4 Proof of Theorem 2.2.1 18
4.1 The strategy 18
4.2 Proof of Lemma 4.1.1 19
4.3 Proof of Lemma 4.1.2 20

5 Proof of Proposition 2.3.1 21
5.1 Proof of (2.17)–(2.18) 21
5.2 The pathwise balance relation for the enstrophy 22

---

[1] September 14, 2010, MSC 2010: Primary 60H15; Secondary 76A05, 76D05. Key words and phrases: stochastic partial differential equation, power law fluids,

[2] Supported in part by JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research, Kiban (C) 21540125

1 Introduction

We consider a viscous, incompressible fluid whose motion is subject to a random force. The container of the fluid is supposed to be the torus $\mathbb{T}^d = (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^d \cong [0,1]^d$ as a part of idealization. For a differentiable vector field $v : \mathbb{T}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$, which is interpreted as the velocity field of the fluid, we denote the *rate of strain tensor* by:

$$e(v) = \left(\frac{\partial_i v_j + \partial_j v_i}{2} \right) : \mathbb{T}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{1.1}$$

We assume that the extra stress tensor:

$$\tau(v) : \mathbb{T}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d$$

depends on $e(v)$ polynomially. More precisely, for $\nu > 0$ (the kinematic viscosity) and $p > 1$,

$$\tau(v) = 2\nu(1 + |e(v)|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}} e(v). \tag{1.2}$$

The linearly dependent case $p = 2$ is the *Newtonian fluid*, which is described by the Navier-Stokes equation, the special case of (1.13)–(1.14) below. On the other hand, both the *shear thinning* ($p < 2$) and the *shear thickening* ($p > 2$) cases are considered in many fields in science and engineering. For example, shear thinning fluids are used for automobile engine oil and pipeline for crude oil transportation, while applications of shear thickening fluids can be found in modeling of body armors and automobile four wheels driving systems.

We now explain the outline of the present paper before going through precise definitions (cf. sections 1.1–1.4 below). The velocity field of the fluid $X_t : \mathbb{T}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ at time $t > 0$, given X_0 is described by the following SPDE:

$$\mathrm{div}\ X_t = 0, \tag{1.3}$$

$$\partial_t X_t + (X_t \cdot \nabla) X_t = -\nabla \Pi_t + \mathrm{div}\ \tau(X_t) + \partial_t W_t. \tag{1.4}$$

Here, and in what follows,

$$u \cdot \nabla = \sum_{j=1}^d u_j \partial_j \ \text{ and } \ \mathrm{div}\ \tau(u) = \left(\sum_{j=1}^d \partial_j \tau_{ij}(u) \right)_{i=1}^d \quad \text{for } u : \mathbb{T}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{1.5}$$

Both the velocity field $X_t : \mathbb{T}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ and the pressure field $\Pi_t : \mathbb{T}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ are the unknown process in the SPDE. The Brownian motion W_t with values in $L_2(\mathbb{T}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d)$ (the set of vector fields on $\mathbb{T}^d$ with L_2 components) is added as the random force. Note also that the SPDE (1.3)–(1.4) for the case $p = 2$ is the stochastic Navier-Stokes equation [Fl08, FG95].

In [TY10], the following results are obtained for the SPDE (1.3)–(1.4) in consistency with the PDE case with non-random force [MNRR96]:

- There exist weak solutions for $p \in I_d$ with some $\emptyset \neq I_d \subset (1, \infty)$, e.g., $I_d = (3/2, \infty)$, $(9/5, \infty)$, $(2, \infty)$, ... for $d = 2, 3, 4, ...$.
- The pathwise uniqueness of the solution holds for $p \geq 1 + \frac{d}{2}$.

We refer the readers to [TY10, Theorems 2.1.3 and 2.2.1] for more details of the above results.

In the case of stochastic Navier-Stokes equation, i.e., the SPDE (1.3)–(1.4) with $p = 2$, the 2D (two dimensional) case is much better understood than the higher dimensional case. In particular, the weak solution is unique, which turns out to be a strong solution [DD02, Kuk06]. It is also known that the unique solution satisfies the energy *equality*, rather than merely an inequality as in the other dimensions [Fl08, Kuk06]. We note that these nice properties of the solution are obtained via the fact that, for the 2D stochastic Navier-Stokes equation, the Galerkin approximation (cf. section 1.4 below) converges strongly enough.

Two progresses are made in this paper.

First is the generality. The above mentioned nice properties possessed by the 2D stochastic Navier-Stokes equation are carried over to the SPDE (1.3)–(1.4) with $p \in [1 + \frac{d}{2}, \frac{2d}{d-2})$. We will do so by showing that the associated Galerkin approximation converges strongly enough.

The second progress made in this paper is that the method to prove the strong convergence of the Galerkin approximation is more direct than the ones previously used for 2D stochastic Navier-Stokes equation, e.g. [DD02, Kuk06]. Our proof is based essentially only on the Gronwall's lemma. In particular, we do not need any compact embedding theorem for Sobolev-type spaces.

In the rest of this section, we introduce a series of definitions which we need to state out results precisely.

1.1 Function spaces

Let $\mathcal{V}$ be the set of $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued divergence free, mean-zero trigonometric polynomials, i.e., the set of $v : \mathbb{T}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ of the following form:

$$v(x) = \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} \widehat{v}_z \psi_z(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^d, \tag{1.6}$$

where $\psi_z(x) = \exp(2\pi \mathbf{i} z \cdot x)$ and the coefficients $\widehat{v}_z \in \mathbb{C}^d$, $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ satisfy:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{v}_z &= 0 \quad \text{except for finitely many } z, && (1.7)\\ \overline{\widehat{v}_z} &= \widehat{v}_{-z} \quad \text{for all } z, && (1.8)\\ z \cdot \widehat{v}_z &= 0 \quad \text{for all } z. && (1.9) \end{aligned}$$

Note that (1.9) implies that:

$$\text{div } v = 0 \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathcal{V}.$$

For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $v \in \mathcal{V}$ we define:

$$(1 - \Delta)^{\alpha/2} v = \sum_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (1 + 4\pi^2 |z|^2)^{\alpha/2} \widehat{v}_z \psi_z.$$

We equip the torus $\mathbb{T}^d$ with the Lebesgue measure. For $p \in [1, \infty)$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, we introduce:

$$V_{p,\alpha} = \text{the completion of } \mathcal{V} \text{ with respect to the norm } \| \cdot \|_{p,\alpha}, \tag{1.10}$$

where

$$\|v\|_{p,\alpha}^p = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |(1 - \Delta)^{\alpha/2} v|^p. \tag{1.11}$$

Then,

$$V_{p,\alpha+\beta} \subset V_{p,\alpha}, \quad \text{for } 1 \le p < \infty,\ \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } \beta > 0 \tag{1.12}$$

and the inclusion $V_{p,\alpha+\beta} \to V_{p,\alpha}$ is compact if $1 < p < \infty$ [Ta96, p.23, (6.9)].

1.2 The noise

We need the following definition.

Definition 1.2.1 Let $\Gamma : V_{2,0} \to V_{2,0}$ be a self-adjoint, non-negative definite operator of trace class. A random variable $(W_t)_{t \geq 0}$ with values in $C([0,\infty) \to V_{2,0})$ is called a $V_{2,0}$-*valued Brownian motion* with the covariance operator Γ (abbreviated by $\mathrm{BM}(V_{2,0},\Gamma)$ below) if, for each $\varphi \in V_{2,0}$ and $0 \leq s < t$,

$$E\left[\exp\left(\mathbf{i}\langle\, \varphi, W_t - W_s \,\rangle\right) | (W_u)_{u \leq s}\right] = \exp\left(-\frac{t-s}{2}\langle\, \varphi, \Gamma\varphi \,\rangle\right), \quad \text{a.s.}$$

1.3 The SPDE

Given an initial velocity $X_0 = \xi \in V_{2,0}$, the (random) time evolution of the velocity field $X = (X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and the pressure field $\Pi = (\Pi_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is described by the following SPDE: for $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} X_t &\in V_{p,1} \cap V_{2,0}, & (1.13)\\ \partial_t X_t + (X_t \cdot \nabla) X_t &= -\nabla \Pi_t + \mathrm{div}\, \tau(X_t) + \partial_t W_t. & (1.14)\end{aligned}$$

The formal "time derivative" of W_t, a $\mathrm{BM}(V_{2,0},\Gamma)$, is added as the random force. Note that (1.13) implies that $\mathrm{div}\, X_t = 0$ in the distributional sense. As in the case of (stochastic) Navier-Stokes equation, we will reformulate the problem (1.13)–(1.14) into the one which does not contain the pressure. Let:

$$b(v) = -(v \cdot \nabla)v + \mathrm{div}\, \tau(v), \quad v \in \mathcal{V}. \tag{1.15}$$

Then, by integration by parts,

$$\langle\, \varphi, b(v) \,\rangle = \langle\, v, (v \cdot \nabla)\varphi \,\rangle - \langle\, e(\varphi), \tau(v) \,\rangle, \quad \varphi \in \mathcal{V}. \tag{1.16}$$

We generalize the definition of $b(v)$ for $v \in V_{p,1} \cap V_{2,0}$ by regarding $b(v)$ as the linear functional on $\mathcal{V}$ defined by the right-hand-side of (1.16). Let $\mathcal{P} : L_2(\mathbb{T}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d) \to V_{2,0}$ be the orthogonal projection. Then, formally:

$$\begin{aligned} (1.14) &\iff \partial_t X_t = -\nabla \Pi_t + b(X_t) + \partial_t W_t, \\ &\Longrightarrow \partial_t X_t = \mathcal{P} b(X_t) + \partial_t W_t \quad (\text{since } X_t, W_t \in V_{2,0},\ \mathcal{P} \circ \nabla \equiv 0) \\ &\iff X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t \mathcal{P} b(X_s) ds + W_t. & (1.17)\end{aligned}$$

We will refer to (1.13) and (1.17) as $(\mathbf{SPLF})_p$ (stochastic power law fluid). More precisely, we pose the following

Definition 1.3.1 Let (X, W) be a pair of processes such that W is a $\mathrm{BM}(V_{2,0},\Gamma)$. We say that (X, W) is a **weak solution** to $(\mathbf{SPLF})_p$ if the following two conditions are satisfied:

a) (1.13) holds in the sense that $t \to X_t$ belongs to:

$$L_{p,\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_+ \to V_{p,1}) \bigcap L_{\infty,\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_+ \to V_{2,0}) \bigcap C(\mathbb{R}_+ \to V_{p' \wedge 2, -\beta}) \ \text{ for } \exists \beta > 0, \tag{1.18}$$

where $p' = \frac{p}{p-1}$.

b) (1.17) holds in the sense that:

$$\langle \varphi, X_t \rangle = \langle \varphi, X_0 \rangle + \int_0^t \langle \varphi, b(X_s) \rangle ds + \langle \varphi, W_t \rangle \tag{1.19}$$

for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{V}$ and $t \geq 0$, cf. (1.16).

1.4 The Galerkin approximation

We now discuss a finite dimensional approximation to $(\mathbf{SPLF})_p$.

For each $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d \backslash \{0\}$, let $\{e_{z,j}\}_{j=1}^{d-1}$ be an orthonormal basis of the hyperplane: $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \ ; \ z \cdot x = 0\}$ and let:

$$\psi_{z,j}(x) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{2} e_{z,j} \cos(2\pi z \cdot x), & j = 1, ..., d-1, \\ \sqrt{2} e_{z,j-d+1} \sin(2\pi z \cdot x), & j = d, ..., 2d-2 \end{cases}, \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^d. \tag{1.20}$$

Then,

$$\{\psi_{z,j} \ ; \ (z,j) \in (\mathbb{Z}^d \backslash \{0\}) \times \{1, ..., 2d-2\}\}$$

is an orthonormal basis of $V_{2,0}$. We also introduce:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathcal{V}_n & = & \text{the linear span of } \{\psi_{z,j} \ ; \ (z,j) \text{ with } z \in [-n,n]^d\}, \\ \mathcal{P}_n & = & \text{the orthogonal projection} : V_{2,0} \to \mathcal{V}_n. \end{array} \tag{1.21}$$

Using the orthonormal basis (1.20), we identify $\mathcal{V}_n$ with $\mathbb{R}^N$, $N = \dim \mathcal{V}_n$ We suppose that:

▶ $\Gamma : V_{2,0} \to V_{2,0}$ is a self-adjoint, non-negative definite operator of trace class such that $\Delta\Gamma = \Gamma\Delta$;

▶ $W = (W_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a BM$(V_{2,0}, \Gamma)$ defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$;

▶ ξ is a $V_{2,0}$-valued random variable defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ such that:

$$m_0 = E[\|\xi\|_{2,0}^2] < \infty; \tag{1.22}$$

We note that the operator Γ has the following eigenfunction expansion:

$$\Gamma = \sum_{z,j} \gamma^{z,j} \langle \cdot, \psi_{z,j} \rangle \psi_{z,j} \ \text{ with } \ \gamma^{z,j} = \langle \Gamma\psi_{z,j}, \psi_{z,j} \rangle. \tag{1.23}$$

We also note that $\mathcal{P}_n W_t$ is identified with an N-dimensional Brownian motion with covariance matrix $\Gamma\mathcal{P}_n$. We consider the following approximation of (1.17):

$$X_t^n = X_0^n + \int_0^t \mathcal{P}_n b(X_s^n) ds + \mathcal{P}_n W_t, \quad t \geq 0, \tag{1.24}$$

where $X_0^n = \mathcal{P}_n \xi$. Let:

$$X_t^{n,z,j} = \langle X_t^n, \psi_{z,j} \rangle \tag{1.25}$$

be the (z,j)-coordinate of X_t^n. Then, (1.24) reads:

$$X_t^{n,z,j} = X_0^{n,z,j} + \int_0^t b^{z,j}(X_s^n) ds + W_t^{z,j}, \tag{1.26}$$

where

$$b^{z,j}(X^n_s) = \langle\, X^n_s, (X^n_s \cdot \nabla)\psi_{z,j} \,\rangle - \langle\, \tau(X^n_s), e(\psi_{z,j}) \,\rangle, \quad W^{z,j}_t = \langle\, W_t, \psi_{z,j} \,\rangle. \tag{1.27}$$

Note also that:

$$X^{n,z,j}_t \equiv 0 \quad \text{if } z \notin [-n,n]^d. \tag{1.28}$$

Let $W.$ and ξ as above. We then define:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}^{\xi,W}_t &= \sigma(\xi, W_s,\ s \le t),\ \ 0 \le t < \infty, \quad \mathcal{G}^{\xi,W}_\infty = \sigma\left(\cup_{t\ge 0}\mathcal{G}^{\xi,W}_t\right), \\ \mathcal{N}^{\xi,W} &= \{N \subset \Omega,\ ;\ \exists \widetilde{N} \in \mathcal{G}^{\xi,W}_\infty,\ N \subset \widetilde{N},\ P(\widetilde{N}) = 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathcal{F}^{\xi,W}_t = \sigma\left(\mathcal{G}^{\xi,W}_t \cup \mathcal{N}^{\xi,W}\right), \quad 0 \le t < \infty. \tag{1.29}$$

The following existence and uniqueness result for the SDE (1.24) was obtained in [TY10]:

Theorem 1.4.1 *Let $W.$, ξ, and $\mathcal{F}^{\xi,W}_t$ be as above. Then, for each $n \ge 1$, there exists a unique process $X.$ such that:*

a) *X^n_t is $\mathcal{F}^{\xi,W}_t$-measurable for all $t \ge 0$;*

b) *(1.24) is satisfied;*

c) *For any $T > 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[\|X^n_T\|_2^2 + 2\int_0^T \langle\, e(X^n_t), \tau(X^n_t) \,\rangle dt\right] &= E[\|X^n_0\|_2^2] + \mathrm{tr}(\Gamma\mathcal{P}_n)T, && (1.30) \\ E\left[\|X^n_T\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{C}\int_0^T \|X^n_t\|^p_{p,1} dt\right] &\le m_0 + (C + \mathrm{tr}(\Gamma))T < \infty, && (1.31) \end{aligned}$$

where $C = C(d,p) \in (0,\infty)$.

Suppose in addition that $p \ge \frac{2d}{d+2}$. Then, for any $T > 0$,

$$E\left[\sup_{t\le T}\|X^n_t\|_2^2 + \int_0^T \|X^n_t\|^p_{p,1} dt\right] \le (1+T)C' < \infty, \tag{1.32}$$

where $C' = C'(d,p,\Gamma,m_0) \in (0,\infty)$.

2 The strong convergence of the Galerkin approximation and the energy equality

2.1 Strong convergence of the Garelkin approximation

We introduce:

$$\lambda = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } d = 2, \\ \dfrac{2(3-p)^+}{dp - 3d + 4} & \text{if } d \ge 3. \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

All the considerations in this article will be limited to the case $p > \frac{3d-4}{d}$ if $d \ge 3$ so that λ makes sense.

For $p \in \left[1 + \frac{d}{2}, \frac{2d,}{d-2}\right)$, the solution to $(\mathbf{SPLF})_p$ is well behaved and is well approximated by the Galerkin approximation:

Theorem 2.1.1 *Let* Γ*,* W *and* ξ *be as in section 1.4, and let* X^n_t *be the unique solution to (1.24) (cf. Theorem 1.4.1). Suppose additionally that:*

$$1+\frac{d}{2} \le p < \frac{2d}{d-2}; \tag{2.2}$$

the operator $\Gamma\Delta$ *is of trace class;* (2.3)

the ramdom variable ξ *takes values in* $V_{2,1}$ *and* $m_1 \overset{\text{def}}{=} E[\|\xi\|^2_{2,1}] < \infty.$ (2.4)

Then, there exists a process $X = (X_t)_{t\ge 0}$ *on* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ *with the following properties for any* $T \in (0,\infty)$*:*

a) *For* $\alpha \in [0,1)$*,* $X \in C([0,\infty) \to V_{2,\alpha})$ *and:*

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T} \|X_t - X^n_t\|_{2,\alpha} \overset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0 \ \ \textit{in probability.} \tag{2.5}$$

b) *With* λ *is defined by (2.1) and* $\alpha = \frac{p-2\lambda}{p} > 0$*,* $X \in L_{2,\mathrm{loc}}([0,\infty) \to V_{2,1+\alpha})$ *and:*

$$\int_0^T \|X_t - X^n_t\|^2_{2,1+\alpha} dt \overset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0 \ \ \textit{in probability.} \tag{2.6}$$

c) *For any* $\widetilde{p} \in [1,p)$*,* $X \in L_{\widetilde{p},\mathrm{loc}}([0,\infty) \to V_{\widetilde{p},1})$ *and:*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} E\left[\int_0^T \|X_t - X^n_t\|^{\widetilde{p}}_{\widetilde{p},1} dt\right] = 0. \tag{2.7}$$

Remarks: 1) Theorem 2.1.1 is applicable to $d = 2, ..., 8$, since $1 + \frac{2d}{d+2} < \frac{2d}{d-2} \iff d \le 8$.
2) The results in the direction of Theorem 2.1.1 and the following Corollary 2.1.2 for 2D stochastic Navier-Stokes equation ($d = p = 2$) were previously obtained in [DD02, Kuk06]. Here, we adopt rather different approach from the ones in these references. The good thing is that our method is more direct.

The existence of the weak solution to the SPDE (1.13)–(1.14) in [TY10] including the shear thinning case ($p < 2$). However, the weak solution discussed there is *not* in general a function of the intial data and the Brownian motion. On the other hand, with Theorem 2.1.1, it is almost straightforward to construct the weak solution to $(\mathbf{SPLF})_p$ as a function of the intial data and the Brownian motion:

Corollary 2.1.2 *Let* Γ*,* W *and* ξ *be as in section 1.4 and suppose additionally that (2.2)–(2.4) hold true. Then, the process* X *in Theorem 2.1.1, coupled with* W *is a weak solution to* $(\mathbf{SPLF})_p$ *such that:*

$$X_0 = \xi; \tag{2.8}$$

$$X_t \textit{ is } \mathcal{F}^{\xi,W}_t\textit{-measurable for all } t \ge 0. \tag{2.9}$$

Moreover, for any $T > 0$*,*

$$E\left[\sup_{t\le T} \|X_t\|^2_2 + \int_0^T \|X_t\|^p_{p,1} dt\right] \le (1+T)C < \infty, \tag{2.10}$$

where $C = C(d,p,\Gamma,m_0) < \infty$*.*

2.2 The energy equality

The strong convergence of the Galerkin approximation proved in Theorem 2.1.1 has the following application:

Theorem 2.2.1 *Let* Γ*,* W *and* ξ *be as in section 1.4 and suppose additionally that (2.2)–(2.4) hold true. Then, the pathwise energy equality holds in the sense that there exists a martingale* M *with respect to the filteration* $\mathcal{F}_t^{\xi,W}$ *such that:*

$$\tfrac{1}{2}\|X_t\|_2^2 = \tfrac{1}{2}\|X_0\|_2^2 - \int_0^t \langle\, e(X_s), \tau(X_s)\,\rangle ds + \tfrac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}(\Gamma)t + M_t, \quad t \geq 0 \tag{2.11}$$

In particular, the mean energy equality holds:

$$\tfrac{1}{2}E\left[\|X_t\|_2^2\right] = \tfrac{1}{2}E\left[\|X_0\|_2^2\right] - E\left[\int_0^t \langle\, e(X_s), \tau(X_s)\,\rangle ds\right] + \tfrac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}(\Gamma)t, \quad t \geq 0. \tag{2.12}$$

Remark: For the 2D stochastic Navier-Stokes equation ($d = p = 2$), (2.11) and (2.12) become respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} \tfrac{1}{2}\|X_t\|_2^2 &= \tfrac{1}{2}\|X_0\|_2^2 - \nu\int_0^t \|\nabla X_s\|_2^2 ds + \tfrac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}(\Gamma)t + M_t, \quad t \geq 0, && (2.13)\\ \tfrac{1}{2}E\left[\|X_t\|_2^2\right] &= \tfrac{1}{2}E\left[\|X_0\|_2^2\right] - \nu E\left[\int_0^t \|\nabla X_s\|_2^2 ds\right] + \tfrac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}(\Gamma)t, \quad t \geq 0. && (2.14)\end{aligned}$$

2.3 Remarks on the 2D stochastic Navier-Stokes equation

In this subsection, we turn to the 2D stochastic Navier-Stokes equation, i.e., the SPDE (1.13)–(1.14) for $d = p = 2$. We remark that some important results from the literature, e.g., [Kuk06, sections 2.4 and 11.1] follow easily from the method of the present paper.
We suppose that:

- ▶ $d = p = 2$;
- ▶ Γ, W and ξ are as in section 1.4;
- ▶ $X^n = (X_t^n)_{t\geq 0}$ is the unique solution to (1.24) (cf. Theorem 1.4.1).

We also suppose that there is an $\alpha = 1, 2, ..$ such that:

$$\text{the operator } \Gamma(-\Delta)^\alpha \text{ is of trace class;} \tag{2.15}$$

$$\text{the ramdom variable } \xi \text{ takes values in } V_{2,\alpha} \text{ and } E[\|\xi\|_{2,\alpha}^2] < \infty. \tag{2.16}$$

Let $X = (X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be the limit as $n \nearrow \infty$ of the process X^n as described in Theorem 2.1.1. Then, by Corollary 2.1.2, the pair (X, W) is identified with the unique weak solution to the SPDE (1.13)–(1.14). Moreover, by Theorem 2.2.1, the process X satisfies the energy equalities (2.13)–(2.14).

Proposition 2.3.1 *Under the above assumptions, it holds for any* $T \in (0, \infty)$ *and* $\alpha_1 < \alpha$ *that:*

$$\sup_{0\leq t\leq T} \|X_t^n\|_{2,\alpha}^2 + \int_0^T \|X_t^n\|_{2,\alpha+1}^2 dt \quad n = 1, 2, ... \text{ are tight;} \tag{2.17}$$

$$\sup_{0\leq t\leq T} \|X_t^n - X_t\|_{2,\alpha_1}^2 + \int_0^T \|X_t^n - X_t\|_{2,\alpha_1+1}^2 dt \overset{n\nearrow\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0 \text{ in probability.} \tag{2.18}$$

Suppose in particular that (2.15)–(2.16) are true for $\alpha = 2$. *Then, the pathwise balance relation for the enstrophy holds in the sense that there exists a martingale* M *with respect to the filteration* $\mathcal{F}_t^{\xi,W}$ *such that:*

$$\tfrac{1}{2}\|\nabla X_t\|_2^2 = \tfrac{1}{2}\|\nabla X_0\|_2^2 - \nu \int_0^t \|\Delta X_s\|_2^2 ds + \tfrac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}(-\Gamma\Delta)t + M_t, \ \ t \geq 0. \tag{2.19}$$

As a consequence,

$$\tfrac{1}{2}E\left[\|\nabla X_t\|_2^2\right] = \tfrac{1}{2}E\left[\|\nabla X_0\|_2^2\right] - \nu E\left[\int_0^t \|\Delta X_s\|_2^2 ds\right] + \tfrac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}(-\Gamma\Delta)t, \ \ t \geq 0. \tag{2.20}$$

Remark: The mean balance relation for the enstrophy (2.20) can be used together with (2.14) to disprove Kolmogorov type scaling law for 2D turbulent fluids [FGHR08, p.11, Theorem 2.9].

3 Proof of Theorem 2.1.1

Let $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, $n < m$ and

$$Z_t = Z_t^{m,n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X_t^m - X_t^n. \tag{3.1}$$

To prove Theorem 2.1.1, it is enough to prove the following properties:

a) For $\alpha \in [0, 1)$,

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|Z_t^{m,n}\|_{2,\alpha} \stackrel{m,n\longrightarrow\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0 \ \text{ in probability.} \tag{3.2}$$

b) With λ is defined by (2.1) and $\alpha = \frac{p-2\lambda}{p} > 0$,

$$\int_0^T \|Z_t^{m,n}\|_{2,1+\alpha}^2 dt \stackrel{m,n\longrightarrow\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0 \ \text{ in probability.} \tag{3.3}$$

c) For any $\widetilde{p} \in [1, p)$,

$$E\left[\int_0^T \|Z_t^{m,n}\|_{\widetilde{p},1}^{\widetilde{p}} dt\right] \stackrel{m,n\longrightarrow\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0. \tag{3.4}$$

3.1 (3.2) implies (3.3)–(3.4)

We first prove (3.3)–(3.4) assuming (3.2). We will also need the following fact, which can be seen from the proof of [TY10, Lemma 3.2.2]:

Lemma 3.1.1 a) *For* $p \geq 1 + \frac{2d}{d+2}$,

$$E\left[\int_0^T \|X_s^n\|_{2,2}^{\frac{2p}{p+2\lambda}} dt\right] \leq C_T < \infty. \tag{3.5}$$

b) *For* $2 \leq p < \frac{2d}{d-2}$. *Then, for any* $\widetilde{p} \in (1, p)$, *there exists* $\alpha > 1$ *such that:*

$$E\left[\int_0^T \|X_s^n\|_{p,\alpha}^{\widetilde{p}} dt\right] \leq C_T < \infty.$$

Proof of (3.3): We have by interpolation that:

$$\|Z^{m,n}_t\|^2_{2,1+\alpha} \le \|Z^{m,n}_t\|^{\frac{4\lambda}{p+2\lambda}}_{2,\alpha} \|Z^{m,n}_t\|^{\frac{2p}{p+2\lambda}}_{2,2}$$

and hence that:

$$\int_0^T \|Z^{m,n}_t\|^2_{2,1+\alpha} dt \le S^{\frac{4\lambda}{p+2\lambda}}_{m,n} I_{m,n},$$

where

$$S_{m,n} = \sup_{t\le T} \|Z^{m,n}_t\|_{2,\alpha} \text{ and } I_{m,n} = \int_0^T \|Z^{m,n}_t\|^{\frac{2p}{p+2\lambda}}_{2,2} dt$$

Since $S_{m,n} \overset{m,n\longrightarrow\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$ in probability by (3.2) and $\{I_{m,n}\}_{m,n\ge 1}$ are tight by (3.5), we get (3.3). □

Proof of (3.4): By (3.3),

$$\int_0^T \|Z^{m,n}_t\|_{1,1} dt \overset{m,n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0 \quad \text{in probability } (P)$$

Moreover, the the above random variables are uniformly integrable, since

$$E\left[\left(\int_0^T \|Z^{m,n}_t\|_{1,1} dt\right)^p\right] \overset{(1.32)}{\le} C_T < \infty.$$

Therefore,

1) $$\lim_{m,n\to\infty} E\left[\int_0^T \|Z^{m,n}_t\|_{1,1} dt\right] = 0.$$

Let $m(\ell), n(\ell) \nearrow \infty$ be such that:

2) $$\Phi_{\ell,t} \overset{\text{def}}{=} |Z^{m(\ell),n(\ell)}_t| + |\nabla Z^{m(\ell),n(\ell)}_t| \overset{\ell\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0, \ \ dt|_{[0,T]} \times dx \times P\text{-a.e.},$$

where $dt|_{[0,T]} \times dx$ denotes the Lebesgue measure on $[0,T] \times \mathbb{T}^d$. Such sequences $m(\ell), n(\ell)$ exist by 1). The sequence $\{\Phi_{\ell,\cdot}\}_{\ell\ge 1}$ are uniformly integrable with respect to $dt|_{[0,T]} \times dx \times P$. In fact,

$$E\left[\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \Phi^p_{\ell,t} dt\right] \overset{(1.32)}{\le} C_T < \infty.$$

Therefore, 2) together with this uniform integrability implies (3.4) along the subsequence $m(\ell), n(\ell)$. Finally, we get rid of the subsequence, since the subsequence as $m(\ell), n(\ell)$ above can be chosen from any subsequence of m, n given in advance. □

3.2 The bound by Gronwall's lemma

We will prove (3.2) in sections 3.2–3.3. We start with an easy Itô calculus. We write $|z|_\infty = \max_{1\le i\le d} |z_i|$ for $z = (z_1, ..., z_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Lemma 3.2.1

$$\begin{aligned} &\|Z_t\|_2^2 \\ &= \|(\mathcal{P}_m - \mathcal{P}_n)\xi\|_2^2 + \mathrm{tr}(\mathcal{P}_m\Gamma - \mathcal{P}_n\Gamma)t + 2M^{m,n}_t + 2\int_0^t \langle\, Z_s, (\mathcal{P}_m - \mathcal{P}_n) b(X^n_s)\,\rangle ds \\ &\quad +2\int_0^t \langle\, Z_s, b(X^m_s) - b(X^n_s)\,\rangle ds, \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

where

$$M_t^{m,n} = \sum_{\substack{z,j \\ n<|z|_\infty\le m}} \int_0^t Z_s^{z,j} dW_s^{z,j}. \tag{3.7}$$

Proof: We write:

$$Z_t = (\mathcal{P}_m - \mathcal{P}_n)\xi + \int_0^t (\mathcal{P}_m b(X_s^m) - \mathcal{P}_n b(X_s^n))\, ds + (\mathcal{P}_m - \mathcal{P}_n) W_t.$$

Since

$$\|Z_t\|_2^2 = \sum_{z,j} |Z_t^{z,j}|^2,$$

we compute each summand. Recall that $n < m$. If $|z|_\infty \le n$, then,

$$Z_t^{z,j} = \int_0^t \left(b^{z,j}(X_s^m) - b^{z,j}(X_s^n)\right) ds,$$

and thus,

$$|Z_t^{z,j}|^2 = 2\int_0^t Z_s^{z,j}\left(b^{z,j}(X_s^m) - b^{z,j}(X_s^n)\right) ds.$$

On the other hand, if $n < |z|_\infty \le m$, then,

$$Z_t^{z,j} = \xi^{z,j} + \int_0^t b^{z,j}(X_s^m) ds + W_t^{z,j}.$$

With the martingale:

$$M_t^{z,j} = \int_0^t Z_s^{z,j} dW_s^{z,j},$$

we have:

$$\begin{aligned} |Z_t^{z,j}|^2 &= |\xi_t^{z,j}|^2 + 2\int_0^t Z_s^{z,j} b^{z,j}(X_s^m) ds + 2M_t^{z,j} + \gamma^{z,j} t \\ &= |\xi_t^{z,j}|^2 + 2\int_0^t Z_s^{z,j}\left(b^{z,j}(X_s^m) - b^{z,j}(X_s^n)\right) ds \\ &\quad + 2\int_0^t Z_s^{z,j} b^{z,j}(X_s^n) ds + 2M_t^{z,j} + \gamma^{z,j} t, \end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma^{z,j} = \langle\, \Gamma\psi_{z,j}, \psi_{z,j}\,\rangle$. Putting these together, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} &\|Z_t\|_2^2 \\ &\quad = \|(\mathcal{P}_m - \mathcal{P}_n)\xi\|_2^2 + \mathrm{tr}(\mathcal{P}_m\Gamma - \mathcal{P}_n\Gamma)t + 2M_t^{m,n} + 2\sum_{\substack{z,j \\ n<|z|_\infty\le m}} \int_0^t Z_s^{z,j} b^{z,j}(X_s^n) ds \\ &\qquad + 2\sum_{\substack{z,j \\ |z|_\infty\le m}} \int_0^t Z_s^{z,j}\left(b^{z,j}(X_s^m) - b^{z,j}(X_s^n)\right) ds, \end{aligned}$$

which is (3.6). □

We will use the following technical lamma:

Lemma 3.2.2 *[MNRR96, p.255, Lemma 4.35] Let* $q \in (2, \infty)$ *if* $d = 2$, *and* $q \in [2, \frac{2d}{d-2}]$ *if* $d \geq 3$. *Then, there exists* $c \in (0, \infty)$ *such that:*

$$\|v\|_q \leq c \|v\|_2^{\theta} \|\nabla v\|_2^{1-\theta} \quad \textit{with } \theta = \tfrac{2d - q(d-2)}{2q} \tag{3.8}$$

for all $v \in V_{2,1}$ *with* $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} v = 0$.

We also recall that:

$$\langle\, w, (v \cdot \nabla) w \,\rangle = 0, \tag{3.9}$$

$v \in \mathcal{V}$ and $w \in C^1(\mathbb{T}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d)$.

Lemma 3.2.3 *Referring to Lemma 3.2.1, let:*

$$\begin{aligned} S_T^{m,n} \;\; = \;\; & \|(\mathcal{P}_m - \mathcal{P}_n)\xi\|_2^2 + \operatorname{tr}(\mathcal{P}_m \Gamma - \mathcal{P}_n \Gamma) T + 2 \sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} |M_s^{m,n}| \\ & + 2 \int_0^T |\langle\, Z_s, (\mathcal{P}_m - \mathcal{P}_n) b(X_s^n) \,\rangle| ds. \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Then, for $p \geq 1 + \frac{d}{2}$,

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|Z_t\|_2^2 \leq S_T^{m,n} \exp\left(C \int_0^T \|\nabla X_s^m\|_p^{\frac{2p}{2p-d}} ds \right). \tag{3.11}$$

Proof: We bound the last integral on the right-hand-side of (3.6) as follows:

1) $\qquad \langle\, Z_t, b(X_t^m) - b(X_t^n) \,\rangle = -I_t - J_t,$

where

$$I_t = \langle\, Z_t, (X_t \cdot \nabla) X_t^m - (X_t^n \cdot \nabla) X_t^n \,\rangle \;\text{ and }\; J_t = \langle\, e(Z_t), \tau(X_t^m) - \tau(X_t^n) \,\rangle.$$

We have by [MNRR96, p.198, (1.25) and p.196, (1.11)] that:

2) $\qquad J_t \geq c_1 \|e(Z_t)\|_2^2 \geq c_2 \|\nabla Z_t\|_2^2.$

On the other hand, since $X_t^n = X_t^m - Z_t$, we see that

$$\langle\, Z_t, (X_t^n \cdot \nabla) X_t^n \,\rangle \overset{(3.9)}{=} \langle\, Z_t, (X_t^n \cdot \nabla) X_t^m \,\rangle = \langle\, Z_t, ((X_t^m - Z_t) \cdot \nabla) X_t^m \,\rangle,$$

and hence that:

$$I_t = \langle\, Z_t, (Z_t \cdot \nabla) X_t^m \,\rangle.$$

Therefore,

3)
$$\begin{aligned} |I_t| & \overset{\frac{1}{p} + \frac{p-1}{2p} + \frac{p-1}{2p} = 1}{\leq} \|\nabla X_t^m\|_p \|Z_t\|_{\frac{2p}{p-1}}^2 \overset{(3.8)}{\leq} C_3 \|\nabla Z_t\|_2^{\frac{d}{p}} \|\nabla X_t^m\|_p \|Z_t\|_2^{\frac{2p-d}{p}} \\ & \overset{\frac{d}{2p} + \frac{2p-d}{2p} = 1}{\leq} c_2 \|\nabla Z_t\|_2^2 + C_4 \|\nabla X_t^m\|_p^{\frac{2p}{2p-d}} \|Z_t\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

We see from 1)–3) that for $t \in [0, T]$:

$$\|Z_t\|_2^2 \leq S_T^{m,n} + C_4 \int_0^t \|\nabla X_s^m\|_p^{\frac{2p}{2p-d}} \|Z_s\|_2^2 ds.$$

This implies (3.11) via Gronwall's lemma. □

3.3 Proof of (3.2)

The essential part of the proof of (3.2) is the following:

Lemma 3.3.1 *For $1+\frac{2d}{d+2} \le p < \frac{2d}{d-2}$,*

$$S_T^{m,n} \longrightarrow 0 \text{ in probability as } m,n \longrightarrow \infty,$$

where $S_T^{m,n}$ is defined by (3.10).

Most of this subsection is devoted to the proof of Lemma 3.3.1. Using Lemma 3.3.1, we will prove (3.2) at the end of this subsection.

Referring to (3.10), it is obvious that:

$$\|(\mathcal{P}_m - \mathcal{P}_n)\xi\|_2^2 + \mathrm{tr}(\mathcal{P}_m\Gamma - \mathcal{P}_n\Gamma)T \longrightarrow 0, \quad m,n \longrightarrow 0. \tag{3.12}$$

On the other hand, it is easy to prove that:

$$E\left[\sup_{0\le t\le T} |M_t^{m,n}|^2\right] \longrightarrow 0, \quad m,n \longrightarrow \infty. \tag{3.13}$$

To see this, we compute the quadratic variation of $M^{m,n}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\, M^{m,n}\,\rangle_t &= \int_0^t \langle\, (\mathcal{P}_m\Gamma - \mathcal{P}_n\Gamma)X_s^m, X_s^m\,\rangle ds \\ &\le \|\mathcal{P}_m\Gamma - \mathcal{P}_n\Gamma\|_{2\to 2}\int_0^t \|X_s^m\|_2^2 ds. \end{aligned}$$

Here, and in what follows, we denote the norm of the bounded operators on $V_{p,0}$ by:

$$\|\ \cdot\ \|_{p\to p}. \tag{3.14}$$

We have that:

$$\|\mathcal{P}_m\Gamma - \mathcal{P}_n\Gamma\|_{2\to 2}^2 \le \sum_{\substack{z,j \\ n<|z|\le m}} |\gamma^{z,j}|^2 \longrightarrow 0,$$

and that:

$$\sup_m E\left[\int_0^t \|X_s^m\|_2^2 ds\right] \le C_t < \infty,$$

by (1.32). Thus, by Doob's L^2-maximal inequality,

$$E\left[\sup_{0\le t\le T} |M_t^{m,n}|^2\right] \le 4E\left[\langle\, M^{m,n}\,\rangle_T\right] \longrightarrow 0.$$

Therefore, to prove Lemma 3.3.1, it is enough to show that:

$$\int_0^T |\langle\, Z_s, (\mathcal{P}_m - \mathcal{P}_n)b(X_s^n)\,\rangle| ds \longrightarrow 0 \text{ in probability as } m,n \longrightarrow \infty, \tag{3.15}$$

if $1+\frac{2d}{d+2} \le p < \frac{2d}{d-2}$.

The rest of this section will be devoted to the proof of (3.15). We start by cutting the task into pieces. Since $(\mathcal{P}_m - \mathcal{P}_n)Z_s = (1-\mathcal{P}_n)X^m_s$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle\, Z_s, (\mathcal{P}_m - \mathcal{P}_n)b(X^n_s)\,\rangle| &= |\langle\,(1-\mathcal{P}_n)X^m_s, b(X^n_s)\,\rangle| \\ &\le \|(1-\mathcal{P}_n)X^m_s\|_{p,1}\|b(X^n_s)\|_{p',-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

With $\alpha > 1$ to be specified later on, we bound the first factor of (3.16) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \|(1-\mathcal{P}_n)X^m_s\|_{p,1} &= \|(1-\Delta)^{1/2}(1-\mathcal{P}_n)X^m_s\|_p \\ &= \|(1-\mathcal{P}_n)(1-\Delta)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}}(1-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}X^m_s\|_p \\ &\le \varepsilon_n\|X^m_s\|_{p,\alpha}, \quad \text{where } \varepsilon_n = \|(1-\mathcal{P}_n)(1-\Delta)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}}\|_{p\to p}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

As for the second factor of (3.16), we use [TY10, (1.31)–(1.32)] to get:

$$\begin{aligned} \|b(X^n_s)\|_{p',-1} &= \|-(X^n_s\cdot\nabla)X^n_s + \operatorname{div}\tau(X^n_s)\|_{p',-1} \\ &\le C\|X^n_s\|_{p,1}\|X^n_s\|_2 + C(1+\|\nabla X^n_s\|_p)^{p-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

Putting (3.16)–(3.18) together, we have:

$$\int_0^T |\langle\, Z_s, (\mathcal{P}_m - \mathcal{P}_n)b(X^n_s)\,\rangle| ds \le C\varepsilon_n\left(I^{m,n}_T + J^{m,n}_T\right),$$

where

$$I^{m,n}_T = \int_0^T \|X^m_s\|_{p,\alpha}\|X^n_s\|_{p,1}\|X^n_s\|_2 ds, \quad J^{m,n}_T = \int_0^T \|X^m_s\|_{p,\alpha}(1+\|\nabla X^n_s\|_p)^{p-1}ds. \tag{3.19}$$

We will prove (3.15) by showing that:

$$\varepsilon_n \to 0 \text{ for any } \alpha > 1; \tag{3.20}$$

$$\{I^{m,n}_T\}_{m,n},\ \{J^{m,n}_T\}_{m,n} \text{ are tight for some } \alpha > 1. \tag{3.21}$$

Since $(1-\Delta)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}} : V_{p,0} \to V_{p,0}$ is compact for any $\alpha > 1$, (3.20) follows from the following:

Lemma 3.3.2 *Let $G : V_{p,0} \to V_{p,0}$ be a compact operator. Then,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\|(1-\mathcal{P}_n)G\|_{p\to p} = 0.$$

Proof: Since the projection $\mathcal{P}_n$ corresponds to the rectangular partial summation of the Fourier series, $\|\mathcal{P}_n\|_{p\to p}$ is bounded in n (see e.g.,[Gra04, p.213, Theorem 3.5.7]). Assuming this, the proof of the lemma is standard. $\square$

We now turn to (3.21). We will use some facts from [TY10]. For $v \in \mathcal{V}$, we introduce:

$$\mathcal{I}_p(v) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d}(1+|e(v)|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}}|\nabla e(v)|^2, \tag{3.22}$$

$$\mathcal{K}(v) = \langle\, -\Delta v, (v\cdot\nabla v)v\,\rangle - \langle\,\tau(v), e(-\Delta v)\,\rangle + \tfrac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}(-\Delta\Gamma\mathcal{P}_n). \tag{3.23}$$

Since $|\Delta v| \le |\nabla e(v)|$, we have

$$\|\Delta v\|_2^2 \le \mathcal{I}_p(v) \quad \text{for } p \ge 2. \tag{3.24}$$

Then, we have from the proof of [TY10, Lemma 3.2.3] that:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{K}(v)+c_1\mathcal{I}_p(v) &\leq C_1(1+\|\nabla v\|_2^2)^\lambda(1+\|\nabla v\|_p)^p, &(3.25)\\ E\left[\int_0^T \frac{\mathcal{I}_p(X_t^n)}{(1+\|X_s^n\|_2^2)^\lambda}dt\right] &\leq C_T<\infty. &(3.26)\end{aligned}$$

Having prepared all the ingredients from [TY10], our starting point to prove (3.21) is the following tightness lemma (Lemma 3.3.3). In fact, this tightness, together with Lemma 3.1.1 is enough for the proof of (3.21) for $p=2$ (cf. the proof of Lemma 3.3.6 below).

Lemma 3.3.3 *Let* $p \geq 1+\frac{2d}{d+2} \geq 2$. *Then,*

$$\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}\|X_t^n\|_{2,1}, \quad n=1,2,..$$

are tight.

Proof: Note that $p \geq 1+\frac{2d}{d+2} > \frac{3d-4}{d}$. For $x \geq 0$, let:

$$f(x)=\begin{cases}\frac{1}{1-\lambda}(1+x)^{1-\lambda} & \text{if } \lambda\neq 1,\\ \ln(1+x) & \text{if } \lambda=1\end{cases}.$$

The condition $p \geq 1+\frac{2d}{d+2}$ guarantees that $\lambda\in[0,1]$ and hence that:

$$0\leq f(x)\to\infty \quad \text{as } x\to\infty.$$

Thus, taking (1.32) into account, it is enough to prove that:

1) $$E\left[\sup_{0\leq t\leq T} f(\|\nabla X_t^n\|_2^2)\right]\leq C_T<\infty.$$

We have by Itô's formula that:

2) $$f(\|\nabla X_t^n\|_2^2)\leq f(\|\nabla X_0^n\|_2^2)+N_t^n+2\int_0^t\frac{\mathcal{K}(X_s^n)ds}{(1+\|\nabla X_s^n\|_2^2)^\lambda}.$$

where

$$N_t^n=\sum_{z,j}\int_0^t\frac{\Delta X_s^{n,z,j}}{(1+\|\nabla X_s^n\|_2^2)^\lambda}dW_s^{z,j},$$

cf. [TY10, proof of Lemma 3.2.3]. We see from (3.25) that:

$$\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}\int_0^t\frac{\mathcal{K}(X_s^n)ds}{(1+\|\nabla X_s^n\|_2^2)^\lambda}\leq C_1\int_0^T(1+\|\nabla X_s^n\|_p)^p ds,$$

and hence that:

3) $$E\left[\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}\int_0^t\frac{\mathcal{K}(X_s^n)ds}{(1+\|\nabla X_s^n\|_2^2)^\lambda}\right]\leq C_T<\infty.$$

by (1.32). On the other hand, we compute:

$$\langle\, N^n\,\rangle_t=\sum_{z,j}\int_0^t\frac{(\Delta X_s^{n,z,j})^2}{(1+\|\nabla X_s^n\|_2^2)^{2\lambda}}ds=\int_0^t\frac{\|\Delta X_s^n\|_2^2}{(1+\|\nabla X_s^n\|_2^2)^{2\lambda}}ds.$$

Thus, by Doob's inequality, (3.24) and (3.26),

4) $$E\left[\sup_{0\le t\le T}|N^n_t|^2\right]\le 4E\langle\, N^n\,\rangle_T\le C_T<\infty.$$

We conclude 1) from 2)–4). ☐

The following estimate plays a key role in the proof of (3.21) for $p>2$:

Lemma 3.3.4 *Let:*

$$\begin{array}{ll} p>1,\;\; 2<p_1<\infty & \text{if } d=2,\\ p>\frac{3d-4}{d},\;\; 2<p_1<p\frac{d}{d-2} & \text{if } d\ge 3, \end{array} \tag{3.27}$$

and let:

$$p_2<p/\theta,\quad \text{where }\ \theta=\frac{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p_1}}{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{d-2}{dp}}\in(0,1). \tag{3.28}$$

Then, for any $\delta>0$, there are $b,C\in(0,\infty)$ such that for $v\in\mathcal{V}$:

$$\|\nabla v\|^{p_2}_{p_1}\le C\frac{\mathcal{I}_p(v)}{(1+\|\nabla v\|_2^2)^\lambda}+C(1+\|\nabla v\|_2^2)^b(1+\|\nabla v\|_p)^\delta, \tag{3.29}$$

where λ is defined by (2.1). For $d\ge 3$, it is possible to take $\delta=0$.

Proof: Let $q=2$ for $d\ge 3$, $q\in(1,2)$ for $d=2$, $p_3=p\frac{d}{d-q}>p$. The choice of p_3 is made so that:

1) $$\|v\|_{p_3}\le C\mathcal{I}_p(v)^{\frac{q}{2p}}(1+\|\nabla v\|_p)^{\frac{2-q}{2}},\quad \text{cf. [MNRR96, p.227,(3.27)]}.$$

Let also:

$$\theta_1=\frac{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p_1}}{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{d-q}{dp}},\quad \text{so that }\ \frac{1}{p_1}=\frac{1-\theta_1}{2}+\frac{\theta_1}{p_3}.$$

With $\beta=\frac{1-\theta_1}{2}+\frac{\lambda q}{2p}\theta_1$ and $\theta_2\in(0,1)$, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla v\|_{p_1}&\overset{\text{Hölder}}{\le}\|\nabla v\|_2^{1-\theta_1}\|\nabla v\|_{p_3}^{\theta_1}\overset{1)}{\le}C\|\nabla v\|_2^{1-\theta_1}\mathcal{I}_p(v)^{\frac{\theta_1 q}{2p}}(1+\|\nabla v\|_p)^{\frac{2-q}{2}\theta_1}\\ &= C\left(\frac{\mathcal{I}_p(v)}{(1+\|\nabla v\|_2^2)^\lambda}\right)^{\frac{\theta_1 q}{2p}}(1+\|\nabla v\|_2^2)^\beta(1+\|\nabla v\|_p)^{\frac{2-q}{2}\theta_1}\\ &\overset{\text{Young}}{\le} C\left(\frac{\mathcal{I}_p(v)}{(1+\|\nabla v\|_2^2)^\lambda}\right)^{\frac{\theta_1}{\theta_2}\frac{q}{2p}}+C(1+\|\nabla v\|_2^2)^{\frac{\beta}{1-\theta_2}}(1+\|\nabla v\|_p)^{\frac{2-q}{2}\frac{\theta_1}{1-\theta_2}}.\end{aligned}$$

and hence that:

2) $$\|\nabla v\|^{p_2}_{p_1}\le C\frac{\mathcal{I}_p(v)}{(1+\|\nabla v\|_2^2)^\lambda}+C(1+\|\nabla v\|_2^2)^b(1+\|\nabla v\|_p)^\delta$$

where

$$p_2=\frac{\theta_2}{\theta_1}\frac{2p}{q},\quad b=\frac{\beta}{1-\theta_2}p_2,\quad \delta=\frac{2-q}{2}\frac{\theta_1}{1-\theta_2}p_2.$$

In particular, for $d\ge 3$:

$$p_2=\frac{\theta_2}{\theta_1}p,\quad b=\frac{\beta}{1-\theta_2}p_2,\quad \delta=0.$$

Choosing θ_2 close to 1 (and then q close 2 if $d=2$), we get the lemma. ☐

Lemma 3.3.4 is used to obtain the following tightness lemma, which takes care of the case of $p>2$:

Lemma 3.3.5 *Suppose that:*

$$\begin{array}{ll} p \geq 2, \ \ 2 < p_1 < \infty & \text{if } d = 2, \\ p \geq 1 + \frac{2d}{d+2}, \ \ 2 < p_1 < p\frac{d}{d-2} & \text{if } d \geq 3 \end{array} \tag{3.30}$$

and that (3.28) holds. Then,

$$\int_0^T \|\nabla X_t^n\|_{p_1}^{p_2} dt, \quad n = 1, 2, ..$$

are tight.

Proof: By (3.29),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \|\nabla X_t^n\|_{p_1}^{p_2} dt \ &\leq \ C \int_0^T \frac{\mathcal{I}_p(X_t^n)}{(1 + \|\nabla X_t^n\|_2^2)^\lambda} dt \\ &\quad + C \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (1 + \|\nabla X_t^n\|_2^2)^b \int_0^T (1 + \|\nabla X_t^n\|_p^2)^\delta dt \end{aligned}$$

The random variables on the right-hand side ($n = 1, 2, ...$) are tight, because of (1.32), (3.26), and Lemma 3.3.3. □

We now give the coup de grâce to (3.15):

Lemma 3.3.6 *Let* $1 + \frac{2d}{d+2} \leq p < \frac{2d}{d-2}$*. Then, (3.21) holds.*

Proof: We recall from (3.19) that:

$$I_T^{m,n} = \int_0^T \|X_s^m\|_{p,\alpha} \|X_s^n\|_{p,1} \|X_s^n\|_2 ds, \quad J_T^{m,n} = \int_0^T \|X_s^m\|_{p,\alpha} (1 + \|\nabla X_s^n\|_p)^{p-1} ds.$$

Case 1, $p = 2$:

$$\begin{aligned} I_T^{m,n} \ &\leq \ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|X_t^n\|_{2,1}^2 \int_0^T \|X_t^m\|_{2,\alpha} dt, \\ J_T^{m,n} \ &\leq \ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (1 + \|\nabla X_t^n\|_2) \int_0^T \|X_t^m\|_{2,\alpha} dt. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.1.1 and Lemma 3.3.3, the random variables on the right-hand-side ($m, n = 1, 2, ...$) are tight for some $\alpha > 1$.
Case 2, $2 < p < \frac{2d}{d-2}$: As for $I_{m,n}$,

$$I_T^{m,n} \leq \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|X_t^n\|_2^2 \left(\int_0^T \|X_t^m\|_{p,\alpha}^{p'} dt \right)^{1/p'} \left(\int_0^T \|\nabla X_t^n\|_{p,1}^p dt \right)^{1/p}.$$

Note that $p' < 2 < p$, since $p > 2$. Thus, by Lemma 3.1.1 and (1.32), the random variables on the right-hand side ($m, n = 1, 2, ...$) are tight for some $\alpha > 1$. As for $J_T^{m,n}$, we take $\widetilde{p} \in (1, p)$ so close to p that:

$$p_2 \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} (p-1)\frac{\widetilde{p}}{\widetilde{p} - 1} < p/\theta, \ \ \text{where } \theta = \frac{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}}{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{d-2}{dp}} \in (0, 1).$$

Then,

$$J_T^{m,n} \leq \left(\int_0^T \|X_t^m\|_{p,\alpha}^{\widetilde{p}} dt \right)^{1/\widetilde{p}} \left(\int_0^T (1 + \|\nabla X_t^n\|_p)^{p_2} dt \right)^{\frac{\widetilde{p}-1}{\widetilde{p}}}.$$

By Lemma 3.1.1 and Lemma 3.3.5, the random variables on the right-hand side $(m, n = 1, 2, ...)$ are tight for some $\alpha > 1$. $\Box$

Proof of (3.2): Since $\frac{2p}{2p-d} \leq p$,

$$R_T^m \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_0^T \|\nabla X_s^m\|_p^{\frac{2p}{2p-d}} ds, \quad m = 1, 2, ...$$

are tight by (1.32), and so are $\exp(CR_T^m)$, $m = 1, 2, ...$. Thus, by Lemma 3.3.1,

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|Z_t^{m,n}\|_2^2 \leq S_T^{m,n} \exp(CR_T^m) \stackrel{m,n \longrightarrow \infty}{\longrightarrow} 0 \text{ in probability.}$$

Therefore, we get (3.2) for $\alpha = 0$. We get (3.2) for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ by interpolation and Lemma 3.3.3. $\Box$

3.4 Proof of Corollary 2.1.2

We only have to prove (1.19) and (2.10). By (1.24) and integration by parts, we have for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{V}$ and $t \geq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \varphi, X_t^n \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathcal{P}_n \varphi, \xi \rangle + \int_0^t (\langle X_s^n, (X_s^n \cdot \nabla)\varphi \rangle - \langle e(\varphi), \tau(X_s^n) \rangle) \, ds + \langle \mathcal{P}_n \varphi, W_t \rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

Now, we have by (3.2) that:

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |\langle \varphi, X_t^n - X_t \rangle| \stackrel{n \nearrow \infty}{\longrightarrow} 0 \text{ in probability.}$$

On the other hand, we have by (3.4) and the argument of [TY10, Lemma 4.1.1] that:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T |\langle X_t^n, (X_t^n \cdot \nabla)\varphi \rangle - \langle X_t, (X_t \cdot \nabla)\varphi \rangle| dt &\stackrel{n \nearrow \infty}{\longrightarrow} 0 \text{ in probability,} \\ \int_0^T |\langle e(\varphi), \tau(X_t^n) - \tau(X_t) \rangle| dt &\stackrel{n \nearrow \infty}{\longrightarrow} 0 \text{ in } L_1(P). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we get (1.19) via (3.31). The bound (2.10) follows from (1.32) by Fatou's lemma. $\Box$

4 Proof of Theorem 2.2.1

4.1 The strategy

Note that:

$$\|X_t^n\|_2^2 = \sum_{z,j} |X^{n,z,j}|^2.$$

Applying Itô's formula to $|X^{n,z,j}|^2$ and using (1.26), we see that:

$$|X_t^{n,z,j}|^2 = |X_0^{n,z,j}|^2 + 2\int_0^t X_s^{n,z,j} dW_s^{z,j} + 2\int_0^t X_s^{n,z,j} b_s^{z,j}(X_s^n) ds + \langle\, \psi_{z,j}, \Gamma\psi_{z,j} \,\rangle t. \tag{4.1}$$

Thus,

$$\|X_t^n\|_2^2 - \|X_0^n\|_2^2 = 2M_t^n + 2\int_0^t \langle\, X_s^n, b(X_s^n) \,\rangle ds + \mathrm{tr}(\Gamma\mathcal{P}_n)t,$$

where

$$M_t^n = \sum_{z,j} \int_0^t X_s^{n,z,j} dW_s^{z,j}. \tag{4.2}$$

Since

$$\langle\, v, b(v) \,\rangle = -\langle\, \tau(v), e(v) \,\rangle,$$

we have:

$$\|X_t^n\|_2^2 - \|X_0^n\|_2^2 = 2M_t^n - 2\int_0^t \langle\, \tau(X_s^n), e(X_s^n) \,\rangle ds + \mathrm{tr}(\Gamma\mathcal{P}_n)t, \tag{4.3}$$

Thus, Theorem 2.2.1 follows from the following two lemmas:

Lemma 4.1.1 *Referring to (4.2), there exists a martingale M such that:*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} E\left[\sup_{0\le t\le T} |M_t^n - M_t|\right] = 0 \quad \textit{for any } T \in (0,\infty). \tag{4.4}$$

Lemma 4.1.2 *For any $T \in (0,\infty)$,*

$$\int_0^T |\langle\, e(X_s^n), \tau(X_s^n) \,\rangle - \langle\, e(X_s), \tau(X_s) \,\rangle| ds \overset{n\nearrow\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0 \quad \textit{in probability (P).} \tag{4.5}$$

4.2 Proof of Lemma 4.1.1

It is enough to show that:

1) $$\lim_{m,n\to\infty} E\left[\sup_{0\le t\le T} |M_t^n - M_t^m|\right] = 0.$$

By the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality,

$$E\left[\sup_{0\le t\le T} |M_t^n - M_t^m|\right] \le CE\left[\langle\, M^n - M^m \,\rangle_T^{1/2}\right].$$

We may assume $m > n$. Then

$$M_t^m - M_t^n = \sum_{\substack{z,j \\ n<|z|_\infty\le m}} \int_0^t X_s^{m,z,j} dW_s^{z,j} + \sum_{\substack{z,j \\ |z|_\infty\le n}} \int_0^t (X_s^{m,z,j} - X_s^{n,z,j}) dW_s^{z,j},$$

and thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\, M^m - M^n \,\rangle_t &= \sum_{\substack{z,j \\ n<|z|_\infty\le m}} \int_0^t (X_s^{m,z,j})^2 \gamma^{z,j} ds + \sum_{\substack{z,j \\ |z|_\infty\le n}} \int_0^t (X_s^{m,z,j} - X_s^{n,z,j})^2 \gamma^{z,j} ds \\ &\le Q_t + R_t,\end{aligned}$$

where

$$Q_t = \int_0^t \|(1-\mathcal{P}_n)\sqrt{\Gamma}X_s^m\|_2^2 ds, \quad R_t = \int_0^t \|\sqrt{\Gamma}(X_s^m - X_s^n)\|_2^2 ds.$$

By (1.32), we have:

$$E\left[Q_t\right] \le \|(1-\mathcal{P}_n)\sqrt{\Gamma}\|_{2\to 2}^2 \int_0^t E\left[\|X_s^m\|_2^2\right] ds \le \|(1-\mathcal{P}_n)\sqrt{\Gamma}\|_{2\to 2}^2 C_T \overset{n\nearrow\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0.$$

On the other hand, we see from (3.2) that:

$$E\left[R_t^{1/2}\right] \le \|\sqrt{\Gamma}\|_{2\to 2} E\left[\left(\int_0^t \|X_s^m - X_s^n\|_2^2 ds\right)^{1/2}\right] \overset{m,n\nearrow\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0.$$

Putting things together, we get 1). □

4.3 Proof of Lemma 4.1.2

We write:

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle\, \tau(X_s), e(X_s)\,\rangle - \langle\, \tau(X_s^n), e(X_s^n)\,\rangle \\ &\quad = \ \langle\, \tau(X_s) - \tau(X_s^n), e(X_s)\,\rangle + \langle\, \tau(X_s^n), e(X_s) - e(X_s^n)\,\rangle \end{aligned}$$

In view of this, we will prove (4.5) by showing that:

1) $$\int_0^T |\langle\, \tau(X_s) - \tau(X_s^n), e(X_s)\,\rangle| ds \overset{n\nearrow\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0 \quad \text{in probability } (P),$$

2) $$\int_0^T |\langle\, \tau(X_s^n), e(X_s) - e(X_s^n)\,\rangle| ds \overset{n\nearrow\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0 \quad \text{in probability } (P).$$

To show 1), we note that:

$$|(1+|x|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}}x - (1+|y|^2)^{\frac{p-2}{2}}y| \le C|x-y|(1+|x|+|y|)^{p-2}, \ \ x,y \in \mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Therefore, with $p_1 \in (1,p)$ and $p_1' = \frac{p_1}{p_1 - 1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^T |\langle\, \tau(X_s) - \tau(X_s^n), e(X_s)\,\rangle| ds \\ &\quad \le \ C\int_0^T ds \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |e(X_s) - e(X_s^n)|(1+|e(X_s^n)|+|e(X_s)|)^{p-1} \le C I_n^{\frac{1}{p_1}} (I_n')^{\frac{1}{p_1'}}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$I_n = \int_0^T ds \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |e(X_s) - e(X_s^n)|^{p_1}, \quad I_n' = \int_0^T ds \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (1+|e(X_s^n)|+|e(X_s)|)^{(p-1)p_1'}.$$

Note that $(p-1)p_1' \searrow p$ as $p_1 \nearrow p$. Thus, for p_1 sufficiently close to p, $\{I_n'\}_{n\ge 1}$ are tight by Lemma 3.3.5. On the other hand, $I_n \to 0$ in probability (P) for any $p_1 < p$ by (3.4). Thus,

we get 1).
As for 2), with $p_1 \in (1,p)$ and $p_1' = \frac{p_1}{p_1-1}$ again,

$$\int_0^T ds \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\langle\, \tau(X_s^n), e(X_s) - e(X_s^n)\, \rangle| ds \le J_n^{1/p_1} (J_n')^{1/p_1'},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J_n &= \int_0^T ds \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |e(X_s) - e(X_s^n)|^{p_1}, \\ J_n' &= \int_0^T ds \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\tau(X_s^n)|^{p_1'} \le \nu \int_0^T ds \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (1 + |e(X_s^n)|)^{(p-1)p_1'} \end{aligned}$$

As in the proof of 1), for p_1 sufficiently close to p, $\{J_n'\}_{n\ge1}$ are tight by Lemma 3.3.5, and $J_n \to 0$ in probability (P) for any $p_1 < p$ by (3.4). Thus, we get 2). □

5 Proof of Proposition 2.3.1

5.1 Proof of (2.17)–(2.18)

Note that for $\alpha = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$:

$$\|\nabla^\alpha v\|_2^2 = \langle\, v, (-\Delta)^\alpha v\, \rangle = \sum_{z,j} (-4\pi^2|z|^2)^\alpha \langle\, v, \psi_{z,j}\, \rangle^2, \quad v \in \mathcal{V}.$$

By considering $v = X_t^n$ and using (4.1), we obtain that:

$$\|\nabla^\alpha X_t^n\|_2^2 = \|\nabla^\alpha X_0^n\|_2^2 + 2M_t^n + 2\int_0^t \langle\, (-\Delta)^\alpha X_s^n, b(X_s^n)\, \rangle ds + \mathrm{tr}(\Gamma(-\Delta)^\alpha \mathcal{P}_n)t, \tag{5.1}$$

where

$$M_t^n = \sum_{z,j} \int_0^t (-\Delta)^\alpha X_s^{n,z,j} dW_s^{z,j}. \tag{5.2}$$

Since we assume (2.15), we may repeat the proof of Lemma 4.1.1, with Γ replaced by $\Gamma(-\Delta)^\alpha$ to obtain:

Lemma 5.1.1 *Referring to (5.2), there exists a martingale M such that:*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} E\left[\sup_{0\le t\le T} |M_t^n - M_t|\right] = 0 \quad \textit{for any } T \in (0,\infty). \tag{5.3}$$

We now continue on (5.1). For $p = 2$, we have for $v \in \mathcal{V}$ that:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\, (-\Delta)^\alpha v, b(v)\, \rangle &= \langle\, (-\Delta)^\alpha v, (v\cdot\nabla)v\, \rangle + \nu \langle\, (-\Delta)^\alpha v, \Delta v\, \rangle \\ &= \langle\, (-\Delta)^\alpha v, (v\cdot\nabla)v\, \rangle - \nu \|\nabla^{\alpha+1} v\|_2^2. \end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

Moreover, we have for $d = 2$ that:

$$|\langle\, (-\Delta)^\alpha v, (v\cdot\nabla)v\, \rangle| \le C_1 \|\nabla^{\alpha+1} v\|_2^{\frac{2\alpha-1}{\alpha}} \|\nabla v\|_2^{\frac{\alpha+1}{\alpha}}. \tag{5.5}$$

This follows from the argument in the proof of [Kuk06, p.17, (2.27)]. By (5.5) and Young inequality, we obtain that:

$$|\langle (-\Delta)^\alpha v, (v \cdot \nabla)v \rangle| \le \frac{\nu}{2}\|\nabla^{\alpha+1}v\|_2^2 + C_2\|\nabla v\|_2^{2\alpha+2}. \tag{5.6}$$

By (5.1) and (5.4),

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\nabla^\alpha X_t^n\|_2^2 + 2\nu\int_0^t \|\nabla^{\alpha+1}X_s^n\|_2^2 ds \\ &= \|\nabla^\alpha X_0^n\|_2^2 + 2M_t^n + 2\int_0^t \langle (-\Delta)^\alpha X_s^n, (X_s^n \cdot \nabla)X_s^n \rangle ds + \mathrm{tr}(\Gamma(-\Delta)^\alpha \mathcal{P}_n)t. \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

Therefore, by (5.6),

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\nabla^\alpha X_t^n\|_2^2 + \nu\int_0^t \|\nabla^{\alpha+1}X_s^n\|_2^2 ds \\ &\le \|\nabla^\alpha X_0^n\|_2^2 + 2M_t^n + C_2\int_0^t \|\nabla X_s^n\|_2^{2\alpha+2} + \mathrm{tr}(\Gamma(-\Delta)^\alpha \mathcal{P}_n)t. \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

We conclude the tightness (2.17) from (5.8), using (2.15), (2.16), Lemma 3.3.3 and Lemma 5.1.1. The convergence (2.18) follows from (2.5) and (2.17) via interpolation. □

5.2 The pathwise balance relation for the enstrophy

Here, we prove that the process define by (2.19) is a martingale. Since

$$\langle \Delta v, (v \cdot \nabla)v \rangle = 0, \quad \text{for } v \in \mathcal{V},$$

we set $\alpha = 1$ in (5.7) to get:

$$\|\nabla X_t^n\|_2^2 + 2\nu\int_0^t \|\Delta X_s^n\|_2^2 ds = \|\nabla X_0^n\|_2^2 + 2M_t^n + \mathrm{tr}(\Gamma(-\Delta)\mathcal{P}_n)t, \tag{5.9}$$

where

$$M_t^n = \sum_{z,j}\int_0^t (-\Delta)X_s^{n,z,j} dW_s^{z,j},$$

for which Lemma 5.1.1 (with $\alpha = 1$) is valid. Since we assume (2.15)–(2.16) with $\alpha = 2$, we have by (2.18) that:

$$\sup_{0\le t\le T}\|X_t^n - X_t\|_{2,1}^2 + \int_0^T \|X_t^n - X_t\|_{2,2}^2 dt \overset{n\nearrow\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0 \text{ in probability.} \tag{5.10}$$

Therefore, we let $n \nearrow \infty$ in (5.9) to see that:

$$\|\nabla X_t\|_2^2 + 2\nu\int_0^t \|\Delta X_s\|_2^2 ds = \|\nabla X_0\|_2^2 + 2M_t + \mathrm{tr}(\Gamma(-\Delta))t, \quad t \ge 0.$$

This means that the process defined by (2.19) is exactly the martingale obtained in Lemma 5.1.1 (with $\alpha = 1$). □

Acknowledgments: The author thanks Professor Franco Flandoli, Professor Reika Fukuizumi and Professor Kenji Nakanishi for useful conversation.

References

[DD02] Da Prato, Giuseppe; Debussche, Arnaud: Two-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations driven by a space-time white noise. J. Funct. Anal. 196 (2002), no. 1, 180–210.

[IW89] Ikeda, N. and Watanabe, S. : Stochastic Differential Equations and Diffusion Processes (2nd ed.), North-Holland, Amsterdam / Kodansha,Tokyo (1989).

[Fl08] Flandoli, Franco : An introduction to 3D stochastic fluid dynamics. SPDE in hydrodynamic: recent progress and prospects, 51–150, Lecture Notes in Math., 1942, Springer, Berlin, 2008.

[FG95] Flandoli, Franco ; Gatarek, Dariusz: Martingale and stationary solutions for stochastic Navier-Stokes equations. Probab. Theory Related Fields 102 (1995), no. 3, 367–391.

[FGHR08] Flandoli, F.; Gubinelli, M.; Hairer, M.; Romito, M.: Rigorous remarks about scaling laws in turbulent fluids. Comm. Math. Phys. 278 (2008), no. 1, 1–29.

[Gra04] Grafakos, Loukas: Classical and modern Fourier analysis – Pearson/Prentice-Hall, 2004.

[Kuk06] Kuksin, Sergei B.: Randomly forced nonlinear PDEs and statistical hydrodynamics in 2 space dimensions. Zurich Lectures in Advanced Mathematics. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zurich, 2006. x+93 pp. ISBN: 3-03719-021-3

[MNRR96] Málek, J.; Nečas, J.; Rokyta, M.; Růžička, M.: Weak and measure-valued solutions to evolutionary PDEs. Applied Mathematics and Mathematical Computation, 13. Chapman & Hall, London, 1996. xii+317 pp. ISBN: 0-412-57750-X

[Ta96] Taylor, M. E. : Partial Differential Equations III, Springer-Verlag New York Berlin Heiderberg (1996).

[Te79] Temam, Roger: Navier-Stokes Equations. North-Holland Publishing Company (1979).

[TY10] Terasawa, Yutaka; Yoshida, Nobuo: Stochastic Power Law Fluids: Existence and Uniqueness of Weak Solutions, preprint 2010.

Nobuo Yoshida
Division of Mathematics Graduate School of Science Kyoto University,
Kyoto 606-8502, Japan.
email: `nobuo@math.kyoto-u.ac.jp`
URL: `http://www.math.kyoto-u.ac.jp/~nobuo/`